

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Application of:	)	Confirmation No.: 6374
	)	
Toshiyuki UEDA et al	)	Art Unit: 2809
	)	
I.A. Appln. PCT/JP03/010403	)	Examiner: C. R. Blease
Appln. No.: 10/539,608	)	
	)	June 14, 2007
I.A.Filing Date: 08/13/2003	)	
371(c) Date: December 13, 2005	)	ATTY.'S DOCKET: UEDA=7
	)	
For: MATERIAL FOR SHADOW MASK,	)	
PROCESS FOR PRODUCING...	)	

**REPLY TO SECOND RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT**

Customer Service Window, Mail Stop Amendment  
Honorable Commissioner for Patents  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
Randolph Building  
401 Dulany Street  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Sir:

Applicants acknowledge receipt of the second restriction requirement Office Action mailed May 16, 2007, to which applicants reply below.

**Applicants again respectfully request the PTO to acknowledge receipt of applicants' papers filed under Section 119.**

The second restriction requirement is, for practical purposes, substantially identical to the first restriction requirement, except this time it is based on alleged lack of unity of invention under the applicable PCT Rules 13.1 and 13.2. As applicants must make an election even though the requirement is traversed, applicants hereby respectfully and provisionally elect

Group 1, again comprising claims 1, 2 and 6-15, with traverse and without prejudice.

Applicants again respectfully submit that the two Groups of claims do share the same or corresponding special technical features, even if same are not set forth in the broader claims (respectfully not admitted).

Moreover, the claims of the present application are not unduly complex. To the extent necessary, applicants respectfully rely on the second paragraph of MPEP 803 which **requires** a search and examination of plural patentably distinct groups in a single application, **even when the requirement is correct**, if such a search and examination would not constitute a "serious burden". A complete search of the elected group will also require a search in the location of classification of the process of Group II; and, once such a search has been conducted, which requires no additional burden, the examination of the Group II claims would at most constitute only a small burden, not a serious burden.

Withdrawal of the requirement and an examination of all the claims on the merits are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.  
Attorneys for Applicant

By /SN/  
Sheridan Neimark  
Registration No. 20,520

SN:kg  
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197  
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528  
G:\BN\O\Ohta\UEDA7\pto\2007-06-14PTRPLYRESTRICT.doc